



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/678,170	10/02/2000	Steven D. Kim	MPAT.182CP1	4126

7590

06/03/2004

Scott A. Horstemeyer, Est.
THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP
100 Galleria Parkway
Suite 1750
Atlanta, GA 30339

EXAMINER

MEKY, MOUSTAFA M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2157

10

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/678,170

Applicant(s)

KIM ET AL.

Examiner

Moustafa M Meky

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 March 2004.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/4-1-2004.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. The amendment filed 3/8/2004 has been entered and considered by the examiner and claims 1-21 are presenting for examination.
2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludovici (US Pat. No. 6,567,849) in view of Waters (US Pat. No. 6,564,216).
4. As to claims 1-2, Ludovici shows in Figs 1-3, a web hosting system comprising:
* a plurality of separate web hosting facilities and each one comprises a plurality of servers (www servers), see the abstract, col 2, lines 51-59, col 4, lines 10-25, lines 52-63, col 6, lines 2-5, col 22, lines 54-67, col 27, lines 13-15, col 28, lines 30-33, col 47, lines 34-36. However, Ludovici does not teach a centralized database (He uses distributed databases). Waters shows in Fig 2, the use of a centralized database 204, see col 3, lines 15-17, lines 46-49, col 4, lines 22-25. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Waters with the system of Ludovici in order to utilize the bandwidth being used (the use of plurality of databases would use different communication channels that would lead to a waste of bandwidth).
5. As to claims 3-4, the combination of Ludovici and Waters shows a database access program to allow different users to access information in the database, see Ludovici, col 4, lines 10-25, lines 32-63, col 5, lines 31-51.

6. As to claims 16-17, Ludovici shows that each of the servers is associated with a web hosting provider 310, see col 4, lines 52-63.

7. As to claims 5-15 & 18-19, the claims are similar in scope to claims 1-4 & 16-17, and they are rejected under the same rationale.

Therefore, it can be seen from paragraphs 4-7 that the combination of Ludovici and Waters teaches the limitations of claims 1-21.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Moustafa M Meky whose telephone number is 703-305-9697. The examiner can normally be reached on flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 703-305-4792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M.M.M
June 01, 2004



MOUSTAFA M. MEKY
PRIMARY EXAMINER